arXiv:0806.4720v2 [astro-ph] 17 Jul 2008

ENTROPY LIMIT AND THE COLD FEEDBACK MECHANISM IN COOLING FLOW CLUSTERS

Noam Soker[1]

ABSTRACT

I propose an explanation to the finding that star formation and visible filaments strong in Hα emission in cooling flow clusters occur only if the minimum specific entropy and the radiative cooling time of the intracluster medium (ICM), are below a specific threshold. The explanation is based on the cold feedback mechanism. In this mechanism the mass accreted by the central black hole originates in non-linear over-dense blobs of gas residing in an extended region of the cooling flow region. I use the criterion that the feedback cycle period must be longer than the radiative cooling time of dense blobs for large quantities of gas to cool to low temperature. The falling time of the dense blobs is parameterized by the ratio of the infall velocity to the sound speed. Another parameter is the ratio of the blobs' density to that of the surrounding ICM. By taking the values of the parameters as in previous papers on the cold feedback model, I derive an expression that gives the right value of the entropy threshold. Future studies will have to examine in more detail the role of these parameters, and to show that the observed sharp change in the behavior of clusters across the entropy, or radiative cooling time, threshold can be reproduced by the model.

Subject headings: galaxies: clusters: general — cooling flows — galaxies: active — intergalactic medium — X-rays: galaxies: clusters

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade it has become clear that the intra-cluster medium (ICM) in cooling flow (CF) clusters of galaxies and CF galaxies must be heated, and the heating process should be stabilized by a feedback mechanism (see review by McNamara & Nulsen 2007). However, in many cases the heating cannot completely offset cooling (e.g., Wise et al. 2004;

[1]Department of Physics, Technion−Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel; soker@physics.technion.ac.il.

McNamara et al. 2004; Clarke et al. 2004; Hicks & Mushotzky 2005; Bregman et al. 2006; Salome et al. 2008) and some gas cools to low temperatures and flows inward (e.g., Peterson & Fabian 2006). The mass inflow rate is much below the one that would occur without heating, and the flow is termed a moderate cooling flow (Soker et al. 2001; Soker & David 2003; Soker 2004).

One of the likely ingredients of the moderate CF model is a cold feedback process (Pizzolato & Soker 2005; Soker 2006; Pizzolato 2007). In the cold-feedback model the mass accreted by the central black hole originates in non-linear over-dense blobs of gas residing in an extended region of $r \sim 5-30$ kpc; these blobs are originally hot, but then cool faster than their environment and sink toward the center. The mass accretion rate by the central black hole is determined by the cooling time of the ICM, the entropy profile, and the presence of inhomogeneities (Soker 2006). Most important, the ICM entropy profile must be shallow for the blobs to reach the center as cold blobs. This accretion process is different from the commonly assumed accretion mode in feedback models where the black hole accretes hot gas (hot feedback mechanism) from its vicinity, e.g., via a Bondi-type accretion flow (e.g. Churazov et al. 2002; Nulsen 2004; Omma & Binney 2004; Chandran 2005; Croton et al. 2006; Balmaverde et al. 2008).

Among other things, the cooling of the ICM to low temperatures is inferred from star formation (e.g., Rafferty et al. 2008), and from cool filaments via their Hα emission (Hα filaments). In a recent paper Cavagnolo et al (2008) found that almost all clusters with strong H-alpha emission have a central entropy of $K \equiv kTn_e^{-2/3} \lesssim 30$ keV cm^2; here k is the Boltzmann constant, T is the ICM temperature, and n_e its electron density. This relation might be better presented as a relation between star formation (SF) and the radiative cooling time: no star formation is seen if the radiative cooling time is $\tau_{\rm cool} \gtrsim 5\times10^8$ yr or the entropy is $K \gtrsim 30$ keV cm^2 (Rafferty et al. 2008).

Voit et al. (2008) suggest that this $K-$Hα (or SF$-\tau_{\rm cool}$ relation) results from a competition between radiative cooling of cooler regions and heat conduction into these regions. In high entropy ICM the heat conduction manages to prevent thermal instabilities that potentially could form Hα filaments. For the cooling function dependance on temperature Voit et al. (2008) assumed $\Lambda \propto T^{1/2}$. However, for most clusters the temperature in the inner region is $T < 3$ keV, and for a composition above half a solar the cooling function is basically constant in the range $\sim 1.7-3$ keV. This introduces a very small change in the numerical value, and is not significant. But it does show that the dependance on some power of the entropy is an approximate one. The same holds for the explanation proposed here (see section 3). More significant is their assumption that the size of the cooling region is of the order of the radius of the cluster at the location of the region. The instabilities at such scale are

likely to be very fragmented (fractal), such that the heat conduction is more efficient than what they assume (because the temperature gradient is larger across the smaller dimension of a filament, and the surface area for heat conduction is much larger). Also, if in some regions the magnetic field lines are closed on themselves on a much smaller scale than the distance to the cluster center r, then the heat conduction is limited to within magnetic flux tubes (Soker et al. 2004; Soker 2004). Another point of concern is discussed in section 3.

A detail study of the competition between radiative cooling of cool filaments, at a temperature of $\sim 10^4$ K, and heat conduction from the ICM is presented by Nipoti & Binney (2004). They find that cool filaments survive only if the ICM density is high and the ICM temperature is low, i.e., has a low entropy. However, Nipoti & Binney (2004) argue that the filaments do not originate from the hot ICM as Voit et al. (2008) consider, but rather the cool gas originates from other sources, e.g., AGN activity and external infall.

Voit et al. (2008) note that the radiative cooling rate of the ICM depends on entropy, and that the $K-\mathrm{H}\alpha$ relation might be alternatively related to the short radiative cooling time of the low-entropy ICM, hence better termed $\mathrm{SF}-\tau_{\rm cool}$ relation (Rafferty et al. 2008). In this paper I use the competition between radiative cooling time and the infall time of dense blobs as developed for the cold feedback mechanism by Pizzolato & Soker (2005), to explain the $K-\mathrm{H}\alpha$ ($\mathrm{SF}-\tau_{\rm cool}$) relation.

2. THE COLD FEEDBACK EXPLANATION

In the cold feedback mechanism cold dense blobs fall toward the center of the cluster and feed the central AGN. Say a region in the cluster is perturbed, and blobs start to cool. As the first blobs fall and reach the center, an AGN outburst will heat the perturbed region, and prevent further cooling. The condition for large quantities of gas to cool is for the feedback cycle to be longer than the radiative cooling time

$$t_{\rm cyc} \gtrsim t_{\rm cool}. \tag{1}$$

The cooling time of a blob with a density of δ times the ambient density, hence a temperature δ times lower, is given by

$$t_{\rm cool} \simeq \frac{nk(T/\delta)}{\delta n_e n_p \Lambda}, \tag{2}$$

where n, n_e, n_p are the total, electron, and proton densities of the ICM, respectively, and T is the ICM temperature. In equation (2) the increase in the cooling function Λ and in

the density with decreasing temperature of the cooling blob was accounted for. For the relevant temperature range here, 1.5 keV $\lesssim kT \lesssim$ 4 keV, and for solar composition the cooling function is $\Lambda \simeq 2 \times 10^{-23}$ erg cm^2 s^{-1} (Gaetz et al. 1988).

For the feedback cycle time I assume the following. The dense blob falls with its terminal velocity v_t. Pizzolato & Soker (2005) studied the fall of dense blobs through the ICM, and found the terminal velocity to be

$$v_t \simeq 60 \left(\frac{a}{100 \text{ pc}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{g}{10^{-8} \text{ cm s}^{-2}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\delta}{3} \right)^{1/2} \text{ km s}^{-1}, \tag{3}$$

where a is the radius of a spherical falling blob, g is the cluster's gravitational field, and the same scaling as theirs was used here. In this paper I scale the blob size and density contrast with the typical values used by Pizzolato & Soker (2005). I incorporate the radius of the blob and δ into a parameter η, such that the average inflow velocity of the blob is $\eta C_s = \eta (5kT/3\mu m_H)^{1/2}$, where C_s is the sound speed of the ICM. For a cluster temperature of 2 keV, a velocity of 50 km s^{-1} corresponds to $\eta = 0.07$. The feedback cycle period is then

$$t_{\rm cyc} = \frac{r}{\eta C_s}. \tag{4}$$

Inserting equations (2)-(4) in condition (1) gives the condition for the formation of a large quantities of cold gas

$$\begin{aligned} r \gtrsim D_c \equiv \eta C_s \frac{nkT}{\delta^2 n_e n_p \Lambda} \\ = 1.1 \left(\frac{\eta}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{3} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{2 \times 10^{-23} \text{ erg cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{K}{10 \text{ keV cm}^2} \right)^{3/2} \text{ kpc}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $K = kT n_e^{-2/3}$ is the entropy. The above condition implies that for blobs to cool within the cooling radius, the entropy must be lower than some threshold.

The power of the entropy in equation (5) is an approximate one. The value of 3/2 was obtained under the assumption that the infall speed of dense blobs is proportional to the sound speed, and on that the cooling gas is in the temperature range where the cooling function does not depend on temperature. The last assumption is a good approximation for most clusters near the threshold $K \simeq 30$ keV cm^2. In any case, in the cold feedback mechanism what matters is the radiative cooling time. This is also seems to be the case from observations (Rafferty et al. 2008).

Condition (5) is sensitive to the value of δ and η. Here I simply took the same value used by Pizzolato & Soker (2005). In obtaining η I assumed a blob size of ~ 100 pc, as the scaling

used by them, and for δ I took the value of an unstable blob used by them. The parameter η has in it the dependance on the blob radius as $a^{1/2}$, and on the density contasrt as $\delta^{1/2}$. Thereofre, condition (5) practically depends on $a^{1/2}$ and $\delta^{3/2}$. The limit value of 1.1 kpc in condition (5) is similar to the one obtained by Voit et al. (2008). With their typical value of the heat conduction suppression factor $f_c = 0.2$ their equation (2) has a limit of 1.8 kpc. However, they use a lower value for the cooling function (because they take the dependance to be $\Lambda \propto T^{1/2}$). If I take a value for Λ as they take, then the two coefficient are almost equal. Still, the sensitivity of condition (5) to the parameters η and δ is a somewhat weak point of the proposed explanation.

The cold feedback mechanism can account also for the finding that the low entropy clusters have stronger radio emission (Donahue et al. 2005; Cavagnolo et al. 2008). The same source of blobs that lead to the formation of Hα filaments, will feed the AGN activity. Cavagnolo et al. (2008) noticed that below the threshold $K < 30$ keV cm^2 there is no correlation between radio power and the central entropy. They tentatively speculated that this lack of correlation hints that cold-mode accretion (Pizzolato & Soker 2005; Hardcastle et al. 2007) might be the dominant process feeding the AGN.

3. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

In this paper I showed that the findings of Rafferty et al. (2008) that no star formation (SF) is seen if the radiative cooling time is $\tau_{\rm cool} \gtrsim 5 \times 10^8$ yr, and of Cavagnolo et al. (2008) that almost all clusters with strong H-alpha emission have a central entropy of $K \equiv kTn_e^{-2/3} \lesssim 30$ keV cm^2, might be explained by comparing the cooling time of dense blobs in the ICM (eq. 2) with the response time (cycle time) of the AGN feedback heating. This time is taken to be equal to the fall time of the dense blobs to the center (eq. 4). Many dense blobs will cool to low temperatures if the response time is longer than their cooling time (eq. 1). This leads to equation (5) which is the main result of this paper. It shows that for blobs to cool within the cooling flow (CF) radius, the entropy must be lower than some threshold.

The feedback heating of the ICM in this model is maintained by dense blobs that are accreted by the central black hole and originate in non-linear over-dense blobs of gas residing in an extended region of $r \sim 5 - 30$ kpc; this is the cold feedback mechanism (Pizzolato & Soker 2005; Soker 2006).

Criterion (5) can be compared with the one derived by Voit et al. (2008) $r \gtrsim 4(K/10 \text{ keV cm}^2)^{3/2} f_c^{1/2}$, where f_c is the suppression factor of the heat conductivity,

taken to be $f_c \sim 0.1-1$ in their model. The similarity of the expressions are interesting. They have the same dependance on the entropy, a similar numerical factor, and some parameters. Voit et al. (2008) consider their expression to satisfactorily explain their observations. The similarities between the two conditions show that the cold feedback explanation proposed here should be considered in future studies as well. In particular, the result is satisfactory if we consider the crude derivation performed here, and the inhomogeneous nature of the ICM, where large regions with lower entropy than the average exist. The dense blobs will be more likely to develop in these regions.

The value of $f_c \sim 0.1-1$ and the large thermally unstable regions considered by Voit et al. (2008) implies that heat conduction is globally important in the CF region. However, models based only on global heat conduction are unstable and require fine tuning (Bregman & David 1988; Soker 2003; Kim & Narayan 2003). The explanation of Voit et al. (2008) requires a stabilizing mechanism. In a recent paper Guo et al. (2008) built a feedback model based on both heat conduction and AGN heating. They showed that the AGN heating stabilizes the feedback mechanism.

There is a price payed to achieve the stability in the model of Guo et al. (2008). (1) The inner boundary of their simulation is at $r = 1$ kpc. They require that all the mass that enters the $r = 1$ kpc sphere will reach the central BH, and the mechanical energy of the launched jet be $L_{\rm agn} = \epsilon \dot{M}(1 \ {\rm kpc})c^2$, with $\epsilon \simeq 0.1 - 0.3$. This is an extremely efficient conversion of mass inflowing at $r = 1$ kpc to mechanical energy of the jets. (2) In their stable model of A1795 (their model A3) the entropy decreases with radius, such that the model is unstable to convection. This might not be a big concern, as by using a different AGN heating prescription the negative entropy might be removed (Guo, F., private communication 2008). (3) In their best models of A2199 (model B3) and of A2052 (model C3) the response time of the AGN is too long. Using their values of the mass inflow rate and density at $r = 1$ kpc, the inflow velocity $v_f(1 \ {\rm kpc})$ can be calculated. The respond of the accreting black hole to changes in the ICM is on a time scale of $\tau_r = 1 \ {\rm kpc}/v_f$. I find $\tau_r = 7$ Gyr for model B3 and $\tau_r = 8$ Gyr for model C3. In both cases the response time τ_r is about an order of magnitude longer than the cooling time in the center of these clusters (0.6 and 1.1 Gyr, respectively). This shows that the AGN heating has no time to respond to changes in the thermal state of the ICM. It is possible that this problem will disappear if an episodic AGN heating will be applied (Guo, F., private communication 2008).

The explanation proposed here for the $K-{\rm H}\alpha$ relation (or ${\rm SF}-\tau_{\rm cool}$ relation) has to overcome some difficulties as well. In the first step it will be required to show that reasonable values for the two parameters used in the model (δ and η) can lead to the sharp transition from bright Hα clusters, for $K < 30$ keV cm^2, to clusters with no, or very weak , detection

of Hα emission. Here I note that the values of η and δ used here are the typical values used by Pizzolato & Soker (2005). If I insert the threshold value of $K = 30$ keV cm^2 found by Cavagnolo et al. (2008), and $\delta \simeq 2.5-3$ used by Pizzolato & Soker (2005), in equation (5) I find the numerical value there to be $\sim 13-6$ kpc. This is inside the range of $r \sim 5-30$ kpc considered by Pizzolato & Soker (2005) to be the region where dense blobs originate. In a later step, numerical simulations of dense blobs in the ICM should show that the formation of cold clouds that are the source of Hα emission depends on entropy in the observed way.

The main difference between the explanation proposed here and that of Voit et al. (2008) is the importance of the global heat conduction. In recent years the debate on the question of whether global heat conduction in CF clusters is important or not has intensified. If that debate is resolved toward a significant global heat conduction, then the explanation proposed here must be ruled out. If it will turned out that global heat conduction is not important, then the explanation of Voit et al. (2008) must be ruled out. In the cold feedback mechanism cold blobs feed the central BH. Therefore, in CF clusters with strong AGN activity, some cold blobs exist close to the center. Therefore, the prediction here is that very low level of Hα emission might be detected even in CF clusters with high entropy.

I thank Mark Voit, Brian McNamara, Fabio Pizzolato, and Fulai Guo for helpful comments. This research was supported in part by the Asher Fund for Space Research at the Technion.

REFERENCES

Balmaverde, B., Baldi, R. D., & Capetti, A. 2008, arXiv:0805.3920

Bregman, J. N., & David, L. P. 1988, ApJ, 326, 639

Bregman, J. N., Fabian, A. C., Miller, E. D., & Irwin, J. A. 2006, ApJ, 642, 746

Cavagnolo, K. W., Donahue, M., Voit, G. M., & Sun, M. 2008, ApJ Letters, submitted, arXiv:0806.0382

Chandran, B. D. G. 2005, ApJ, 632 ,809

Churazov, E., Sunyaev, R., Forman, W., & Böhringer, H. 2002, MNRAS, 332, 729

Clarke, T. E., Blanton, E. L., & Sarazin, C. L. 2004, ApJ, 616, 178

Croton, D. J., Springel, V., White, S. D. M., De Lucia, G., Frenk, C. S., Gao, L., Jenkins, A., Kauffmann, G., Navarro, J. F., & Yoshida, N., 2006, MNRAS, 365, 11

Donahue, M., Voit, G. M., ODea, C. P., Baum, S. A., & Sparks, W. B. 2005, ApJ, 630, L13

Gaetz, T. J., Edgar, R. J., & Chevalier, R. A. 1988, ApJ, 329, 927

Guo, F., Oh, S. P. & Ruszkowski M. 2008, arXiv:0804.3823

Hardcastle, M. J., Evans, D. A., & Croston, J. H. 2007, MNRAS, 376, 1849

Hicks, A. K., & Mushotzky, R. 2005, ApJ, 635, L9

Kim W.-T., & Narayan R., 2003, ApJ, 596, 889

McNamara, B. R., & Nulsen, P. E. J. 2007, ARA&A, 45, 117

McNamara, B. R., Wise, M. W., & Murray, S. S. 2004, ApJ, 601, 173

Nipoti, C., & Binney, J. 2004, MNRAS, 349, 1509

Nulsen, P. 2004, in The Riddle of Cooling Flows in Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies, ed. T. H. Reiprich, J. C. Kempner, & N. Soker (Charlottesville: Univ. Virginia), http://www.astro.virginia.edu/coolflow/proc.php (astro-ph/0310195)

Omma, H., & Binney, J. 2004, MNRAS, 350, L13O

Peterson, J. R., & Fabian, A. C. 2006, PhR, 427, 1

Pizzolato, F. 2007 in Heating versus Cooling in Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies, Eso Astrophysics Symposia (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg), 243 (astro-ph/0611214)

Pizzolato, F. & Soker, N. 2005, ApJ, 632, 821

Rafferty, D., McNamara, B., & Nulsen, P. 2008, arXiv:0802.1864

Salome, P., Combes, F., Revaz, Y., Edge, A. C., Hatch, N. A., Fabian, A. C., & Johnstone, R. M. 2008, A&A, 484, 317

Soker, N. 2003, MNRAS, 342, 463

Soker, N. 2004, MNRAS, 350, 1015

Soker, N. 2006, NewA, 12, 38

Soker, N., Blanton, E. L., & Sarazin, C. L. 2004, A&A, 422, 445

Soker, N. & David, L. P., 2003, ApJ, 589, 770

Soker, N., White, R, E., III, David, L. P., & McNamara, B. R. 2001, ApJ, 549, 832

Voit, G. M., Cavagnolo, K. W., Donahue, M., Rafferty, D. A., McNamara, B. R., & Nulsen, P. E. J. 2008, arXiv:0806.0384

Wise, M. W., McNamara, B. R., & Murray, S. S. 2004, ApJ, 601, 184

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.